

**REMARKS**

This Amendment addresses the Office Action dated June 1, 2007. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application, as amended.

By this Amendment, Claims 1, 2 and 6-8 have been amended to more particularly recite subject matter Applicants' regard as their invention and as discussed in detail below. Claims 6-8 have also been amended for clarity of expression. Claim 5 was previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 9-17 have been added. Thus, Claims 1-4 and 6-17 are pending.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 USC §103 over U.S. Patent No. 6,598,167 to Devine et al. ("*Devine*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,510,464 to Grantges et al. ("*Grantges*").

Without acceding to the rejection, Claims 1, 2 and 6-8 have been amended to more particularly recite subject matter that Applicants' regard as their invention. In particular, Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, that a first protocol used between the client machine and the server machine is a non-secure stateless protocol, and that the method comprises inserting the certificate unmodified into a cookie header of a request in the first protocol, transmitting the request, including the cookie header containing said certificate, from the security module to the server machine using the first protocol, and that the cookie header of the request includes a plurality of cookies. Support is provided, for example, at paragraphs [0033] and [0043] of Applicants' specification.

It is apparent that the applied references do not teach or suggest the above-discussed combination of features recited in Claim 1.

For example, the Office Action acknowledges at page 5 that the primary reference, *Devine*, does not disclose inserting a certificate into a cookie header of a request, as recited in Claim 1. However, it is alleged that *Devine*'s failure in this regard is cured by the teachings provided by secondary reference *Grantges*.

In contrast to the claimed invention, however, *Grantges* teaches a gateway proxy server 40 that builds an "authentication cookie 90" in response to authentication data received from the authorization server 46 "indicative of whether the tendered digital certificate successfully authenticated." See *Grantges*, col. 10, lines 6-25; and FIG. 1. It is thus apparent that *Grantges* does not teach or suggest inserting the certificate unmodified into a cookie header of a request, as recited in Claim 1. For example, *Grantges* further teaches that his "[a]uthentication cookie 90 may include information such as timestamp information indicating a time of successful authentication" of the certificate. *Grantges*, col. 10, lines 13-15.

Therefore, it is apparent that neither *Devine* nor *Grantges* teaches or suggests inserting the certificate unmodified into a cookie header of a request, as recited in Claim 1.

Furthermore, Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, that a first protocol used between the client machine and the server machine is a non-secure stateless protocol, and transmitting the request, including the cookie header containing said certificate, from the security module to the server machine using the first protocol. It is apparent that the applied references also do not teach or suggest this feature recited in Claim 1.

For example, *Devine* teaches transmitting cookies and requests using a secure protocol, for example, SSL-based HTTP (i.e., "HTTPS"). See *Devine*, col. 20, line 54 to col. 21, line 11; col. 8, lines 17-30; col. 11, lines 34-38; and col. 13, lines 29-61.

*Grantges*, for its part, teaches only passing certificates using a secure protocol, for example, SSL-based HTTP (i.e., "HTTPS"). See *Grantges*, col. 9, lines 4 and 46-53; and FIG. 3. Thus it is apparent that neither *Devine* nor *Grantges* teaches or suggests transmitting the request, including the cookie header containing the certificate, from the security module to the server machine using the first [non-secure] protocol, as recited in Claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 distinguishes patentably from the applied references.

In addition, Claim 6 recites, *inter alia*, that a first protocol used between the client machine and server machine is a non-secure stateless protocol, and an analyzer configured to insert an unmodified certificate into a cookie header of an HTTP or equivalent request, and further configured to transmit to a server said unmodified certificate contained in said cookie header using said first protocol.

Claim 7 recites, *inter alia*, the first protocol comprising a non-secure stateless protocol, and that the security module comprises an analyzing program configured to insert an unmodified certificate sent by the client machine into a cookie header of a request in conformance with said non-secure stateless protocol, and wherein the analyzing program is further configured to transmit to a server said unmodified certificate contained in said cookie header using said non-secure stateless protocol.

Claim 8 recites, *inter alia*, that a first protocol used between the client machine and the server machine is a non-secure stateless protocol, inserting the certificate unmodified into a cookie header of a request, and transmitting the request, including the cookie header containing the unmodified certificate, from the security module to the server machine using said first protocol.

Therefore, Claims 6-8 are also believed to distinguish patentably from the applied references for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 1.

Further, addressing the concerns stated in the Office Action at page 4, Claims 1, 2 and 6-8 have been amended to clarify that the recited "cookie header" refers to the cookie header of the request, and not to a portion of an individual cookie itself. Support is provided, for example, at paragraphs [0018] to [0021] of Applicants' specification.

New dependent Claims 9-17 have been added to protect additional subject matter analogous to dependent Claims 2-4. Dependent Claims 2-4 and 9-17 are also believed to be patentable due at least to their dependence from Claims 1 and 6-8, as well as for the additional subject matter recited in the dependent Claims 2-4 and 9-17.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-4 and 6-17 distinguish patentably from the applied references. A prompt Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that any further action is necessary to place this application in better form for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1165 (T2147-907679) any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this paper and to credit any overpayment to that Account. If any extension of time

is required in connection with the filing of this paper and has not been separately requested, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

October 1, 2007

By: 

Edward J. Kondracki  
Reg. No. 20,604

Eric G. King  
Reg. No. 42,736

Miles & Stockbridge, P.C.  
1751 Pinnacle Drive  
Suite 500  
McLean, Virginia 22102-3833  
(703) 610-8647  
4825-3828-1217